

Comments Submitted by Letter

L-0001

April 15 '03

Michael Collins:

1 | I am concerned/opposed to nuclear waste
being sent to Hanford. I understand
Washington state is suing you for violations
of agreements to clean up existing waste
and not bring more in.

2 | Hanford is not appropriate for storage of
this waste that can be used to make dirty
bombs. With all the fears/threats of terrorism
what on earth are you thinking driving
3 | trucks full of dangerous waste all over
the country? Even without terrorism, there
are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of vehicle
accidents daily, often involving trucks.
There is no "clean" nuclear energy.


I am glad the FFTF is finally being
shut down. There is no expense and liability
4 | we don't need. Now clean up Hanford.
When the U.S. government is sued, the
people still pay for it.

And I want to know: are we using
D.U. in Iraq? This is a horrible way.

to dispose of waste. Iraqi citizens and U.S. soldiers are suffering greatly from radiation poisoning, birth defects, etc. I understand we polluted many other countries with this horrible waste that remains toxic virtually forever.

I apologize for not having a computer or good handwriting.

Sincerely,



RECEIVED

APR 21 2003

C. D. SCHMIDT

L-0002

Juno e-mail for hamboni@juno.com printed on Wednesday, April 16, 2003, 7:47 PM

4/16/03

Michael Collins
US Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Mr. Collins;

It seems to me that Department of Energy personnel are immune to the concerns of citizens about the transportation and storing of nuclear wastes.

Why are we not getting a more permanent solution for safeguarding this generation and those to come from the scourge of nuclear materials.

It is hardly something about which to be sanguine; how many people have suffered and died with thyroid disease and cancer? We want CLEAN

1 UP AT HANFORD!. I never see appreciable progress in eliminating this threat to humankind. One might think that the contractors just keep milking the federal budget.

Yours truly, *MaryEllen Hamblin*
MaryEllen Hamblin
15230 S.E. 142 Pl.
Renton, WA 98059

1 of 1

~~Place~~

15230 S.E. 142nd
~~Place~~
Renton, WA 98059
April 17, 2003

Yvonne Sherman
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A7-75
Richland, WA 99352

1 | I am gravely concerned about the importation of transuranic waste to Hanford. I understand this was begun and has only been stopped by legal action by the State of Washington and Heart of America.

Your agency seems to have reversed the program of what needs to be done there. We have had that menace there from the 1940's; WHEN
2 | WILL WASHINGTON STATE BE FREED FROM THAT THREAT TO OUR HEALTH AND OUR ENVIRONMENT?

3 | We certainly don't want more waste---we want CLEAN UP!!

4 | IT IS BEYOND COMPREHENSION THAT YOU WOULD BE DIGGING MORE AND BIGGER TRENCHES TO ACCOMMODATE MORE WASTE.

I believe it is illegal and certainly inhumane to add more rather than destroy or seal this evil substance that has affected the human race in such deleterious ways.

Yours truly,
MaryEllen Hamblin

MaryEllen Hamblin

RECEIVED

APR 22 2003

DOE-RL/RLCC

junomsg://008A6590/

4/16/2003

L-0004

To: Yvonne Sherman, USDepartment Of Energy-Richland
Roy Schepens, USDOE-Office of River Protection
Keith Klein, USDOE-Richland Operations Office
Mike Gerheard, Environmental Protection Agency, Seattle
Tom Fitzsimmons, WA State Department of Ecology
Governor Gary Locke
Christine Gregoire, Attorney General, WA State
From: Marjorie Worthington, 1947 Clovercrest Street, Enumclaw, WA 98022
Date: April 26, 2003
Subject: (1) Hanford Clean-Up Priorities
(2) STOP Transuranic Waste Shipments to Hanford

Dwight D. Eisenhower's warning to the people of the United States to "beware the Military-Industrial Complex" resonates with me as I write yet another letter to demand that our elected officials and those that have been appointed to agencies intended to act in the public interest, adhere to the trust and responsibility of their various offices in the matter of long overdue Cleanup of the Hanford site.

1 Continued violation of the 15 year old Tri-Party Agreement, lack of funding, budget secrecy, *allowing cleanup priorities to be determined by profits to contractors*, rather than those committed to real cleanup: these are only a few of many indications that public trust is indeed being placed secondary to interests that are short-sighted, self-serving, and in the case of the enormous potential for environmental disaster, downright dangerous to public health and safety.

I have already written Governor Locke and Dept. of Ecology Director Tom Fitzsimmons, earlier this year, regarding my outrage at the unnecessary (and I believe illegal) "trade-off" agreement to accept nuclear waste import to the site in exchange for acceleration of *the cleanup process already in place under TPA*, and received answers from both offices that avoided the issue at hand. Why?

I see this as yet another violation of public trust that Cleanup be top priority, thorough, and as speedily implemented as possible. I renew my demand for adherence to the trust and responsibility placed in each of you in the urgent matter of Cleanup of the Hanford site, protecting the future of the Hanford Reach and the Columbia River watershed.

Sincerely,

cc:Heart Of America Northwest

RECEIVED

APR 29 2003

DOE-RL/RLCC

L-0005

102 Otis St.
Walla Walla, WA 99362
April 29, 2003

Dear Ms. Sherman,

I regret not being able to attend the May 1 meeting in Richland to provide input about the Revised Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement.

- 1 The current mission of Hanford is cleanup. More than doubling the total amount of radioactive and chemical waste, including deadly plutonium, is the very opposite of cleanup. Unlined trenches provide no protection from soil and groundwater
- 2 contamination. Contaminated groundwater would flow into the Columbia River for thousands of years! Birth defects and cancer would be our legacy to countless future generations in the Columbia Basin and beyond.
- 3 The very transporting of nuclear waste creates frightening risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. Either an accident or a terrorist act could bring instant catastrophe.
- 4 Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the US. Every effort must be made to vitrify the contents of the leaking tanks as soon as possible. Cleanup funds are already being cut. How could they possibly cover the costs of storing yet more nuclear waste safely? It is not fair to risk the lives of citizens of Washington and Oregon.

Thank you.

Beth Call

Beth Call

102 Otis

Walla Walla, WA 99362

trollshouse@bmi.net

RECEIVED

MAY 02 2003

DOE-RL/RLCC


L-0006

Michael S. Collins
HSW EIS Document Manager
USDOE (A6-38)
Richland, WA

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 I am against any further shipments of radioactive waste to the Hanford Nuclear site.
This site is not adequately prepared to hold any more waste. It is also too dangerous to
transport this type of waste on our nations highways.
Please have no more shipments of the nations radioactive waste sent to Hanford.

Sincerely,



Tom Caldwell

L-0007

PO Box 1222
Walla Walla WA 99362

April 30, 2003

Michael Collins
USDOE
PO Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

RE: Hanford SWEIS

Dear Mr. Collins:

I'm unable to attend the May 1, 2003 public hearing on the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement and hope this letter may be included in the record.

The proposal to ship tons of radioactive waste to Hanford for storage is very troublesome.

- 1 Hanford is currently the country's most contaminated site for radioactive and other toxic chemicals associated with nuclear weapons and power production. Cleanup for existing waste, which is already contaminating groundwater, has been designated as the current mission for the site, but progress has been excruciatingly slow. The proposal to add more waste will simply slow down cleanup even more while increasing the already existing threats to human and environmental health. I understand that the plan even proposes
- 2 dumping this new waste into unlined trenches; if this is true, the irresponsibility of such an proposal is truly spectacular.

- 3 A plan that involves shipping 70,000 truckloads of toxic waste along highways creates an unacceptable risk to the population living along the truck routes.

A responsible EIS would recommend that production of nuclear waste be discontinued until such time as we have safe and effective ways of disposing of it. I would like to see a section of the EIS devoted to a discussion how to implement such a program or to know why this has not been considered in the EIS.

Very truly yours,


Barbara Clark